

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are replacement sheets for Figure 6, and annotated sheets reflecting marked-up changes for Figure 6. Please replace Original Figure 6 with the corresponding replacement sheets.

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated April 21, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claim 1 has been amended and new claims 6-11 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) for the reasons noted therein. As indicated above, the Applicant has amended Figure 6 and amended the specification and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Moreover, the Office Action rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action. The Applicant has amended claim 1 and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Applicant's Related Art (hereinafter "*ARA*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that the *ARA* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-5. Thus, the *ARA* cannot anticipate these claims. In particular, claim 1 recites a cabinet cover comprising, among other features, an aesthetic member where "a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to a rear side of said cabinet cover body with a joint formed by welding." The *ARA* does not disclose this feature.

The Office Action alleges that “the position is taken that the welded portion on (12) would constitute a ‘rear side’ of the element as opposed to a ‘front side’ since the aesthetic member is secured to the ‘rear side’ and not the ‘front side.’” *See e.g.*, Office Action at page 3. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation. As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, the aesthetic member 14 of the *ARA* is secured to the rear side of the cabinet portion. As may be clearly seen in Figure 3 of the *ARA*, the weld “C” is not at a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member 14. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the *ARA* as are claims 2-5, which depend therefrom, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

The Office Action alleges that "the position is taken that the welded portion on (12) would constitute a 'rear side' of the element as opposed to a 'front side' since the aesthetic member is secured to the 'rear side' and not the 'front side.'" *See e.g.*, Office Action at page 3. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation. As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, the aesthetic member 14 of the *ARA* is secured to the rear side of the cabinet portion. As may be clearly seen in Figure 3 of the *ARA*, the weld "C" is not at a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member 14. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the *ARA* as are claims 2-5, which depend therefrom, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant's representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

ANNOTATED MARKED-UP DRAWINGS

FIG. 5




FIG. 6

